

SN. 10/055,722

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:203

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Paragraph 11 of the specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-4, 8, and 11 have been amended improve their form and readability by positively reciting the elements of the first and second lateral transistors. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the structure of the lateral MOS transistor based on an informal telephonic interview with the examiner. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Williams (USP 5,541,125) in view of Krivokapic (USP 6,238,982). Applicant traverses this rejection because the combination would not have taught 1) a second lateral MOS transistor integrated with a first lateral MOS transistor and 2) a punch-through stopper area called for in claim 1.

Applicant thanks the examiner for the informal telephonic interview, where the meaning of "lateral" MOS transistor was discussed. The examiner indicated that the meaning of "lateral MOS transistor" is sufficiently broad to encompass the 20V DMOS structure of Williams as some of the current flows parallel to the substrate. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to define the structure of the lateral MOS transistor. Claim 1 now recites that the first and second lateral MOS transistors each include a well of a first conductivity type and source, channel, and drain region formed in the well.

First, as Williams's second MOS transistor (20V DMOS) does not have the source, channel, and drain areas formed in a first conductivity type well, as called for in claim 1, Williams would not have taught the claimed structure, even if it were properly combined with Krivokapic.

SN. 10/055,722

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:203

Second, claim 1 now calls for the punch-through stopper area that is distinct from the first well. In the Final rejection, the examiner construed William's P-well to correspond to the punch-through stopper area. As claim 1 now defines a punch-through stopper area formed in the first well (as was presented in claim 11), applicant submits that claim 1 further distinguish over the applied references. Note that the area 40 identified by the examiner is not a well but an N-Epi layer. Moreover, even if it were deemed to be a well, it is not the first conductivity type.

### Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references as they do not disclose a second lateral MOS transistor and a punch-through stopper area associated with a first lateral MOS transistor. Applicant thus urges the examiner to enter the present Amendment and issue an early Notice of Allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Date: August 5, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

LYLE KIMMS  
REG. NO. 34079  
RULE 34A  
Marc A. Rossi

Registration No. 31,923

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES  
P.O. Box 826  
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826  
Phone: 703-726-6020

FAX RECEIVED  
AUG - 5 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800